

**Idaho Criminal Justice Commission**  
**Regular Meeting**  
February 26, 2021

**Location:** [Zoom](#)

**Time:** 8 a.m.–12 p.m.

**Idaho Criminal Justice Commission Members Present:**

Eric Fredericksen, Chair, SAPD	Thomas Sullivan, Judge, District Court
Dan Hall, Vice Chair, Chiefs of Police Association	Bart Davis, U.S. Attorney, District of Idaho
Kieran Donahue, Idaho Sheriffs Association	Colleen Zahn, Idaho Attorney General's Office
Ashley Dowell, Comm of Pardons & Parole	Darren Simpson, Judge, District Court
Kedrick Wills, Idaho State Police	Jared Larsen, Office of the Governor
Daniel Chadwick, Public Member	Denton Darrington, Public Member

Marianne King, Office of Drug Policy  
Monty Prow, IDJC  
Darrell Bolz, Public Defense Commission  
Grant Loebs, Prosecuting Attorneys Assoc.  
Eric Studebaker, Department of Education

Comprising a quorum of Idaho Criminal Justice Commission (Commission)

**Idaho Criminal Justice Commission Members Absent:**

Vacant, House Jud, Rules & Admin	Dave Jeppesen, Health & Welfare
Seth Grigg, Idaho Association of Counties	Greg Chaney, House Jud & Rules Chairman
James Cawthon, Judge, District Court	Josh Tewalt, Department of Correction
Todd Lakey, Senate Judiciary & Rules Chairman	Vacant, Comm. on Hispanic Affairs

Grant Burgoyne, Senate Judiciary & Rules  
Sara Omundson, Idaho Supreme Court

**Others Present:**

Kelli D Brassfield, IAC  
Rafael Gonzalez, US Attorney Office  
Jason Spillman, Supreme Court  
Lymaris Ortiz, Comm. on Hispanic Affairs

<b>Agenda</b> <b><i>Who's Responsible</i></b>		Meeting Outcomes/Decisions Reached	Due Date
8:00 am (10 min)	Call to Order– <i>Chair Eric Fredericksen</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome and Roll Call— <i>Chair Eric Fredericksen</i></li> <li>Review Commission's Vision and Mission Statement and Values—<i>Commission Members</i></li> </ul>		
	<b>Commission Management</b>		
8:10 am (20 min)	<b>Action Item</b> – Approve January 2021 Minutes  <u>Subcommittee Reports</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Human Trafficking</li> <li>Mental Health</li> <li>Research Alliance (Report review - Action)</li> <li>Sex Offense</li> </ul>	There was a motion to approve the minutes from January 2021 by Darrell Bolz, Dan Hall seconded. Motion carried.  Human trafficking is still working on the pilot screening process and is hoping to have something to present in the spring.  There was a motion to suspend the research alliance subcommittee until the data systems council can get underway by Ashley Dowell, Colleen Zahn seconded. Motion carried.	
	<b>Promote Well-Informed Policy Decisions</b>		
8:30 am (25 min)	K12 Behavioral Health and Wellness Services Survey - <i>Eric Studebaker, Idaho Department of Education</i>	Student Behavioral Health Services Report:  More than 90% of the school districts participated. Launched in Sept. 2020 and was open until the end of October 2020.  Demographics: District and school administrators participated with a total of 411 survey responses (330 complete responses to 81 partial responses).  Rural v. urban: 57%, 235 respondents were the majority from rural districts and 175 were from non-rural districts.  Frameworks and implementation: Administrators were asked whether their district has a guiding framework or approach for BHWS. 59% use the Positive Behavioral Interventions and supports (PBIS) framework and 48% use social and emotional learning/development framework as their district's guiding framework. 15% of	

		<p>administrators at rural districts said they had no specific guiding framework for BHWS compared to 9% of administrators at non-rural districts.</p> <p><b>Implementation:</b>  The supports most frequently selected for implementation were professional development (65%). Dedicated district level employees focused on BHWS was second with 54% and district level teams was 52%. Rural respondents were more likely to report by 19 percentage points that their district didn't have specific district level policies.</p> <p><b>Approaches to support:</b>  District administrators were asked about the BHWS available to families and caregivers of the K-12 general student population. Districts cited various methods for providing BHWS, and 24% said they do not provide services to families and caregivers at this time. Of the other districts, 45% provide staffing and materials, 39% make direct contact with outside organizations, and 59% specifically recruited employees with specials skills sets.</p> <p><b>Types of services provided:</b>  A little over half of the respondents said their district has strategies that are implements for all students (59%), has lessons and/or strategies available for employees to use (58%), and encourages employees and students to learn about behavioral health (56%). 22% of rural have reported explicit and structured programs for all students, 12 percentage points lower than non-rural.</p> <p><b>Funding:</b>  Administrators were asked how they funded the programs they reported offering and they reported that few programs are supported by state funds dedicated to behavioral health and wellness services, and that financial support is mostly an even mix of general state funding and additional funding sources, or that they are not funded with state dollars.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Perceptions on Efficacy, Barriers, and Impact: Administrators were asked how BHWS are being assessed in their districts. Various methods were cited, and behavioral data reviews were used the most (71%). Student behavior was reviewed next and classrooms were observed as well.</p> <p>Administrators indicated that the top district level barriers were lack of time (83%), funding for resources (78%), limited funding for programs and services (76%), and limited funding for professional development (58%).</p> <p>Rural administrators notably said that location was a barrier.</p> <p>Administrators were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with specific statements about BHWS. More than 90% of administrators agreed with all of the statements about behavioral health</p> <p>Next steps: Met with a collaborative group that has about 90 individuals. There are no statutes or rules that require our schools to provide these services at all. 80% of our schools are providing these services even though they are not required to.</p> <p>What changes are you seeing with kids being at home because of the pandemic? We don't have that data yet. We can look at the call data to the suicide hotline. There has been an increase in calls but not necessarily because of suicide ideation. We know that kids need their extracurricular activities for their well-being and that is definitely being impacted. We just don't have enough data yet.</p> <p>As we move through this process and work plans come out, I may need some support from this commission.</p>	
8:45 am (25 min)	Child Protection – <i>Miren Unsworth, Idaho Department of Health and Welfare</i>	Referrals by maltreatment types: neglect, physical abuse, sexual abuse, other, human trafficking, abandonment. More than 70% of the calls were in regards to neglect. 22% were physical abuse. There was a reduction in referrals last year due to the pandemic but those referrals are coming back up.	

		<p>Sources of referrals: school personnel have been the highest, private agencies and law enforcement were the next highest.</p> <p>The goal is to try to keep the child in the home but the department wants to make sure they are safe. 1,173 children were placed in foster care in 2020. This is down from the previous year.</p> <p>Children can only be removed from the home for a few reasons: law enforcement makes a declaration of eminent danger, a petition can be filed with the court (usually filed by the department), and rule 16. The court has the responsibility to make the decision if a child is removed.</p> <p>1300 exited the system last year.</p> <p>Children served in foster care for state fiscal years: The trend increased from 2016 to 2019 but there was a decrease in 2020. Children are paired with those people or are serviced to match their needs.</p> <p>Placements in foster care: 41% of foster children were placed with non-relatives, and 27% were placed with relatives. For other placements see slide.</p> <p>Placement changes: 65% of children had no changes, 24% had one placement change, and 11% had two or more placement changes.</p> <p>If a child has been in a certain place for 12 months there is a hearing for permanency. 871 children exited foster care and were reunited with parents or their primary caregivers, 208 were adopted by non-relatives, 114 were adopted by relatives, and 83 children aged out of the system.</p> <p>The Child Welfare Transformation effort has deployed a new technology system, which has been working really well, improved business processes, improved timing for safety decisions, and improved backlog of cases.</p>	
--	--	--	--

<p>9:15 am (30 min)</p>	<p>Behavioral Health Council Update – <i>Dave Jeppesen, Idaho Department of Health and Welfare; Sara Omundson, Administrator of the Courts</i></p>	<p>There is a Statewide Strategic Action Plan: define a plan, assess system, determine needs, and recommend actions.</p> <p>Determining needs right now. Focused on the publicly funded programs and services. Behavioral health is mental health and substance use disorder.</p> <p>Systems level planning and change: Three frames: Macro – statewide behavioral health system Meso – organizational partners and users Micro – individual users of the system</p> <p>Framework (public agencies and community partners): Promotion, prevention, engagement, treatment, and recovery Promotion – right conditions exist, what is the environment? Prevention – delivered prior to onset of a disorder Engagement – ability to effectively assist and individual Treatment – services towards recovery Recovery – services for continued support</p> <p>Recommendations: Programs: established and ongoing activities to support BH Projects: time bound activities that help improve community BH Policies: statutes, IDAPA Partnerships: community and public agency partners that are subject matter experts in the area of BH</p> <p>Process: Workgroups bring information to advisory board and then recommendations are sent to the Idaho Behavioral Health Council.</p> <p>IBHC is currently working through some of the recommendations. We will be finalizing the action plan in May/June. Upon approval of the plan the IBHC will transition into an advisory board to implement the plan.</p>	
-----------------------------	--	---	--

		<p>There is a criminal justice work group. They are working hard on some recommendations. You can reach out to this group through Judge Petty.</p> <p>Any specific recommendations at this point? Not yet but will have some around the end of April, beginning of May. Put this on the agenda for review.</p> <p>Do you have data about children in foster care that is caused by or presence of narcotics? 70% of foster care is neglect and almost 100% of those have substance abuse is involved. Substance abuse is almost present in every case.</p>	
9:45 am (15 min)	Other ICJC Business No meeting in March	Bart Davis – I am very pleased to have serviced on this commission. Please welcome Rafael Gonzalez as the interim US Attorney.	
10:00 am	Adjournment		

Next regularly scheduled meeting to be held in Boise, Friday, April 30, 2021

**“Collaborating for a Safer Idaho”**